

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 25-40 are in the application, with Claims 1, 25 and 35 having been amended, and with Claims 11-24 and 49-49 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 25 and 35 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As required by the Examiner, formal drawings (each labeled "Replacement Sheet") are submitted herewith.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 25, 26, 28, and 31-40 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lakritz (U. S. Pat No. 6,623,529).

Claims 3, 5, 6, 27, 29, and 30 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lakritz, and further in view of Pereiral et al., "Java Server Pages 1.2", (C) 2000, found at www.bits-pilani.ac.in/~fx/fxjspbasics.pdf.

Claim 1, as now presented, is directed to a "method in a computer system for preparing a program for customization". Claim 1 recites that, for a plurality of statements of the program, the method includes "retrieving the statement" and "identifying a type of the retrieved statement". Moreover, when the identified type indicates that statements of that type can be customized, the method further includes "identifying content of the statement that can be customized", "storing the identified content in a custom content bundle so that identified content can be later retrieved from the custom content bundle using a content identifier" and "replacing the identified content in the retrieved statement with an include content command having the content identifier so that when the include content command is processed, it retrieves content from a custom content bundle using the content identifier". Further, claim 1 has been amended to specify that "the content identifier [does] not includ[e] the identified content". Support for this amendment is found at page 7, lines 22-28 of the specification. For example, the content identifier "user-search-2/" shown in line 9 of Table 2 (page 9 of the specification) does not include the corresponding identified content ("Find Existing Accounts--Results") from line 6 in

Table 1 (page 8 of the specification). As will be seen, this feature of the present invention allows for greater flexibility than the approach taught by the Lakritz reference.

Applicant observes that the Lakritz reference and the present invention are somewhat related, in that both can be applied to customizing a website to the local language of a user who is accessing the website. However, the present invention uses a different approach from Lakritz, and the approach used by the present invention is more flexible and allows more types of customization than Lakritz's approach.

According to Lakritz's approach, text in a document is replaced with a tag that implements a replace function. Lakritz's replace function tag includes the replaced text. Also, the replaced text is stored in a database to effectively function as an index for corresponding foreign language words or phrases which are also stored in the database. During a user's access to a website, a language appropriate to the user is selected. If the currently selected language differs from that of the replaced text, the tag causes the replaced text to be used as a search key to find the corresponding column of the database, and the appropriate row in that column is indexed by the selected language to provide a translation for the replaced text.

To the contrary, in the invention as recited in claim 1, the identified content is replaced with an "include content command", which includes a content identifier that does not include the identified content (which may be the text to be replaced or other content to be replaced). As a result, the present invention allows for customization of images or other content that cannot readily be used to index a database. Thus the present invention allows for language localization with respect to text and also allows for other types of customization. On the other hand, the Lakritz approach only seems to be suitable for customization of text.

Thus claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinguished from the Lakritz reference, at least because Lakritz lacks the claimed "include content command" having a content identifier that does not include the identified content which the "include content command" replaces.

It is believed that claim 1 is also distinguished from Lakritz on an additional ground. Lakritz, at column 26, lines 19-29, teaches replacing language-specific information in a document with replace commands. But Lakritz fails to disclose replacing content in the

statements of a program, as recited in claim 1. In other words, Lakritz is directed to processing documents, not programs.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.


The other independent claims, which are claims 25 and 35, have been amended in the same manner as claim 1 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 1. All of the other pending claims are dependent claims and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as their parent independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

June 2, 2005
Date



Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460